



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,831	11/13/2001	Anna M. Arcellano-Payne	40655.5600	8586
7590	01/10/2005		EXAMINER	
Thomas V. DelRosario Snell & Wilmer L.L.P. One Arizona Center 400 E. Van Buren Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202			DAS, CHAMELI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2122	
			DATE MAILED: 01/10/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Applicant No.	Applicant(s)
	10/008,831	ARELLANO-PAYNE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	CHAMELI C DAS	2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 9/23/04.
2. Claims 1-2, 10, 13-14 have been amended.
3. Claims 1-14 have been rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pettus, (US 5,499,343)

As per amended claim 1, Pettus (US 5,499,343) discloses:

- ***originating a request on a first computing platform for information located on a second computing platform*** (Fig 15A, col 4, lines 49-59, "form implementing communication between application programs residing in client and server nodes ... server node"), where "client node" and "server node" are the "first computing platform" and "second computing platform"
- ***translating said request into a predetermined format readable by said second platform*** (col 19, lines 1-5, "a first application ... format"), where "converting service request into a predetermined format" clearly shows that translating the request into a predetermined format and (col 9, lines 61-67,

col 10, lines 1-10), where “NSF interface reformats the request and forwards it to the CSF interface” inherently including the “translating said request into a predetermined format” and (col 19, lines 1-10), where “service requests” are formatted into a predetermined format clearly shows that “requests” are translated into a predetermined format, (col 4, lines 50-60, “ “The CSF interface includes remote procedure call (RPC) objects for invoking and **responding to service requests** at the nodes, and application programming interface (API) objects for transporting those requests between the nodes. However, the API objects only provide communication transports within a node. Accordingly, the API and RPC objects interact with dynamically- configurable protocol stacks within the NSF interfaces to complete the transport mechanism needed by an application program on the client node when accessing services on a remote server node”), “ The CSF interface includes remote procedure call (RPC) objects for invoking and **responding to service requests** at the nodes” inherently including the format readable by the second platform as claimed.

- **transmitting the translated request to said second platform** (col 14, lines 35-43), where “request/reply model objects … data stream transactions between client and server nodes” clearly shows that transmitting the translated request to said second platform as claimed.

For claim 10, Pettus discloses translating requests coupled to both said first computing platform and said second computing platform is shown in (col 9, lines 61-67, col 10, lines 1-10).

For the rest of the claims, see the rejections of the previous office action mailed on 6/25/04.

Response to the argument

5. The applicant's argument filed on 9/27/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the Remarks, the applicant has argued in substance:

(1) Pettus does not disclose exchanging information between disparate computing platforms.

Response:

Pettus discloses "request/reply" model which send and receive data stream transactions between client and server (col 14, lines 35-44), which clearly shows exchanging information between disparate computing platforms as claimed.

(2) Pettus does not disclose communication between the disparate computing platforms.

Response:

Pettus discloses "request/reply" model which send and receive data stream transactions between client and server (col 14, lines 35-44), which clearly shows communication between the disparate computing platforms.

(3) Pettus does not disclose or suggest “translating requests”, and particularly, does not disclose “translating said request into a predetermined format readable by said second platform”.

Response:

Pettus discloses “**translating said request into a predetermined format readable by said second platform**” (col 19, lines 1-5, “a first application ... format”), where “converting service request into a predetermined format” clearly shows that translating the request into a predetermined format and Pettus also discloses “request/reply” model which send and receive data stream transactions between client and server (col 14, lines 35-44), which clearly shows that the requests are readable by the second platform.

Conclusion

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chameli Das whose telephone number is 571-272-3696

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 A.M. to 3:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Tuan Dam can be reached at 571-272-3695. The fax number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

An inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9600.

Chameli C. Das
CHAMELI C. DAS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

1/5/05